



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/587,403

06/05/2000

Robert D' Gardos

81866.A

9935

26021

7590

10/12/2005

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

500 S. GRAND AVENUE

SUITE 1900

LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/587,403

Applicant(s)

GARDOS ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/18/2005 (Appeal Brief).
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau. (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The Appeal Brief filed November 24, 2003 has been carefully considered by an Appeal Conference. The conferees agreed that Water~~s~~does teach managing the domain management system, however, Water~~s~~does not clearly point out the process of managing the domain name. Thus the finality of the office action mailed January 13, 2005 is now withdrawn. The office regrets any inconvenience due to the applicant.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters (US 6, 564, 216), and further in view of InterNIC: Updating the domain name and associated records.

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Waters teaches:

(1) domain identification means, coupled to receive input from a party seeking access to the domain management system, for accepting and confirming identity of a domain name to be an active domain name [i.e., after logging in with the server manager 201, each DNS server 202A-N and DHCP server 203A-N must set their server-id, step 306. Each server-id is checked against all of the DNS and DHCP servers already coupled in communication with the server manager 201, step 307. If the server-id is the same as a server-id for a server already on the network, the TCP link for the requesting server will be dropped, step 308. If the server-id is unique to that server, the login process is complete, step 309 (column 5, lines 19-58). In addition, in order to add host information to the central database 204, the server manager 201 must determine if the domain

Art Unit: 2135

**name is available, unavailable, moving from another host or being updated. (column 7, line 16-19)];**

(2) means for determining if the party has authority to alter information about the active domain name and, if the part lacks authority for the active domain name, determining if the party should be given authority for the active domain name; and **[i.e., in order to add host information to the central database 204, the server manager 201 must determine if the domain name is available, unavailable, moving from another host or being updated. Upon receiving a request from a DHCP server 203A to add a host, the server manager 201 first checks if the domain is a Canonical Name (CNAME) or primary name. If the domain is a CNAME, it fails validation and the server manager 201 notifies the DHCP server 203A that the domain is unavailable..sup.11 If the domain does not exist in the central database 204, the label.sup.12 may be assigned to the host and the server manager 201 notifies the DHCP server 203A that the domain is available (column 7, line 16-29)];**

(3) information change means for accepting a request to change information about the active domain name, passing an information change request toward a database authoritative for like information about domain names, and generating a confirmation message displayable to a party using the domain management system **[i.e., The server manager 201 synchronizes all of the requests and updates from the servers and transmits them to the central database 204. The server manager 201 monitors all the DNS servers 202A-N and DHCP servers 203A-N on the network from a single point and acts as a single pipeline to the central database 204. For example, when a new client 208 sends a request for an IP address to a DHCP server 203A, the DHCP server 203A determines if it can send configuration information to the requesting client 208. If the DHCP server 203A can give an IP address and configuration information to the client 208, it sends host configuration information and an IP address to the client 208. The DHCP server 203A automatically registers the new domain name, the IP address and the host configuration information with the central database 204 through the**

**server manager 201. The DNS server 202A detects the new IP address through the server manager and updates its DNS information. When the lease expires or the client 208 leaves the network and releases the IP address, the DHCP server 203A notifies the central database 204 of the change through the server manager 201. The IP address is available for reassignment by the DHCP server 203A to a new client. Therefore, the server manager 201 eliminates the need for the individual DNS servers 202A-N and DHCP servers 203A-N to establish direct communication channels with the central database by providing access to the central database 204 through one communication channel 206 (column 5, lines 32-59)];**

ii. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for authorizing the domain name to be changed and/or altered, as well as generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers (**column 3, lines 8-45**).

iii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contact with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the domain name and associated records)

iv. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. **(column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters).**

v. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) **(column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters).**

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. This claim has some limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

c. Referring to claims 3-5:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) wherein the information change means resides on a server and/or a server coupled to a second server capable of directly accessing a share registry system [i.e., referring to Figure 2, note that a number of DNS servers and DHCP servers share a common central database. Furthermore, note that client can go through a binding server or the DNS/DHCP servers to get to the server manager which then can go to the share register (configuration database)].

d. Referring to claim 6:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) wherein the authoritative database is a shared registry system [i.e., referring again to Figure 2, note all updates for all DNS's are recorded in the central database].

e. Referring to claims 16- 17:

i. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for authorizing the domain name to be changed and/or altered, as well as generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the

servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers (**column 3, lines 8-45**).

iii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contact with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the domain name and associated records)

iv. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. (**column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters**).

v. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) (**column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters**).

f. Referring to claim 7:

i. Waters teaches:

(1) The limitation of generating messages to acknowledging authentication of party seeking access to the domain management system, identifying active domain and issuing update requests is disclosed by Waters (**column 9, lines 5-18**). Note this can include a graphics interface for user, or electronic

message for updating the central database, validating user, or polling devices. Claim 7 is rejected.

ii. Although Waters does not clearly state the role for authorizing the domain name to be changed and/or altered, as well as generating a confirmation message from the server manager 201 as in Figure 2, Waters implies:

(1) The server manager would communicate directly with the plurality of servers and the central database and transmit any requests from the servers to the central database. Therefore, the central database only would need to communicate with the server manager. All configuration changes (i.e., such as domain name), whether made statically, dynamically or at remote locations, are registered in the central database and automatically distributed to the appropriate servers (**column 3, lines 8-45**).

iii. On the other hand, InterNIC teaches:

(1) Updating the domain name and associated records, whether to replace an existing contact with a new contract, or to change information about the organization, or to change name servers – Domain Name Registration Agreement is modified and sent to InterNIC. Once the InterNIC receives the modification request, the tracking number is assigned and an acknowledgement is sent to the individual who submitted the request via e-mail (see page 3 of Updating the domain name and associated records)

iv. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to provide an improved means of communicating between a database and one or more servers. (**column 2, lines 7-9 of Waters**).

v. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) clearly state the role of authorization of the server manager 201 as in Figure 2 of Waters to manage IP addressing in a network and effectively synchronize communication between a central database and one or more servers (such as DNS and DHCP) (**column 2, lines 12-15 of Waters**).



g. Referring to claim 8:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation of a diagnostic utility engine (troubleshooter software) is disclosed by Water (**column 9, lines 9-15**). The operating system continually checks and analyzes the status of the system through electronic communication messages. Claim 8 is rejected.

h. Referring to claims 9-11:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation that the diagnostic utility performs troubleshooting on all parts of the system and report to the network administrator is disclosed by Waters (**column 9, lines 5-35**). Claims 9-11 are rejected.

i. Referring to claim 12:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation that the update engine resides on the accredited registrar (delta-logging facility in the central database) is disclosed by Waters (**column 8, lines 23-24**). Claim 12 is rejected.

j. Referring to claims 13-15:

i. Waters further teaches:

(1) The limitation that the update software can reside on a server that directly access a shared registry, or on a server directly connected to a second server, or passing through a second server connected to the shared registry is disclosed by Waters (**see Figure 2**). Claims 13-15 are rejected.

k. Referring to claims 18-19:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 7, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

l. Referring to claim 20:

i. This claim has some limitations that is similar to those of claim 8, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

**Conclusion**

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. InterNIC: Domain Name Registration Overview discloses the domain name registration process, which could also read on to claims 1 and 7.

b. InterNIC: Registration Process Overview discloses the domain name registration overview.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

TBT

September 26, 2005

  
KIM VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100